

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/695,140	10/25/2000	Rinya Takesue	Q61468	3589
75	90 11/19/2001			
Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas PLLC			EXAMINER	
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue N W Washington, DC 20037-3213			BUTTNER, DAVID J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1712	
			DATE MAILED: 11/19/2001	I

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/695,140 Applicantis)

BUTTNER

Art Unit

1712

TAKESUE



The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period for Reply	TO EVENES O MONTHUS EDOM
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days. 	R 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed ation. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be be be a seriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this
communication.	statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
Status	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This act	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is rte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
4) 💢 Claim(s) <u>1-18</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) X Claim(s) 1-18	is/are rejected.
7)	is/are objected to.
8) Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Application Papers	
9) \square The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/arc	e objected to by the Examiner.
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved.
12) \square The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign	Originty under 30 U.S.C. & 119(a)-(u).
a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:	we have received
1. X Certified copies of the priority documents ha	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	ve peen received in Application No
 Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bur *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of t 	documents have been received in this National Stage eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). he certified copies not received.
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domesti	
Attachment(s)	18] Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	19) Notice of Informal Petent Application (PTO-152)
16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	20) Other:

Application/Control Number: 09/695,140

Art Unit: 1712

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what is required for (A) is claim 1. Is one of (A1) or (A2) required? Is one of (A1) and (A2) required?

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Rees '134 Patent.

Rees exemplifies (#64) a blend of E/MA copolymer, ZnO and stearic acid.

Application/Control Number: 09/695,140 Page 3

Art Unit: 1712

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Waggoner Patent.

Waggoner claims blends of olefin/acid copolymer with a fatty acid. The blend is neutralized. This neutralization can take place after combining the copolymer and fatty acid (see example 18). Applicant's preferred acid (behenic acid) is used in example 20.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nakade or Matsuki Patents in view of Sullivan '760.

Both Nakade and Matsuki produce golf ball materials by further neutralizing ionomers with additional metal. Neither suggest metal stearates, although both suggest fillers such as files, lubricants etc.

Metal stearates are known to improve melt flow, cost etc of ionomeric golf ball materials (see Sullivan col. 5 line 45-57). It would have been obvious to add a metal stearate to Nakade/Matsuki compositions for the expected advantages.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the GB 1113409 Patent.

The reference exemplifies adding fatty acids to highly neutralized ethylene/acid polymers.

This is the same final product as is produced by applicant. In effect, the reference "preblended" applicant's (A) and (c) prior to adding (B).

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the statz WO 00/23519 Patent.

Application/Control Number: 09/695,140

Art Unit: 1712

1712

Statz teaches ionomers for golf balls can be produced by highly neutralizing blends of

Page 4

stearic acid with E/acid (page 10 line 10-17; table 7). This appears to be the essence of

applicant's invention.

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because

a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CAR 1.55. See

MPEP § 201.15.

WO 01/29129 appears to meet applicant's claims but does not qualify as prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Davis Buttner whose telephone number is (703) -308-2403. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 10 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Robert Dawson, can be reached on (703) -308-2340. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) -872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) -308-0661.

Buttner/LR

November 16, 2001

DAVID J. BUTTNER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Our Bitte